

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not initialed and returned the form PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 13, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner initial and return the form PTO/SB/08 in the next communication from the USPTO.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (2002/0016858, hereinafter “Sawada”) in view of Monachello et al. (6,748,439, hereinafter “Monachello”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 4

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Sawada discloses the claimed feature of “an unauthenticated-signal port for outputting the input packet signal to a default network in response to a determination by the authentication existence determination means that the input packet signal does not have a required authentication.” Specifically, the Examiner asserts that paragraphs [0087] and [0123] of Sawada disclose the unauthenticated-signal port. *See* Office Action, page 2. These portions of Sawada describe the interaction between a user terminal, which is not authenticated, and a router when the user terminal attempts to connect to a file server.

However, Sawada neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of outputting the input packet signal to a default network in response to a determination by the authentication existence

determination means that the input packet signal does not have a required authentication. Rather, Sawada discloses that when the user terminal, which is not yet authenticated, sends a packet addressed to a file server, a filtering unit of the router discards the packet according to the contents of a filtering table. *See* Sawada, paragraph [0123]. Sawada neither teaches nor suggests outputting the input packet signal to a default network in response to a determination by the authentication existence determination means that the input packet signal does not have a required authentication, as Sawada discloses nothing about outputting the input packet to a default network. Rather, Sawada discloses that the packet is discarded so that the packet does not arrive at the file server, with no teaching or suggestion that the packet is output to a default network.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Sawada discloses the claimed feature of “temporary-use address offer means for giving a temporary-use IP address for login to the communication terminal in response to the outputting of the input packet signal to the default network by the unauthenticated signal port.” Specifically, the Examiner asserts that paragraphs [0087], [0123], and [0145]-[0150] of Sawada disclose the temporary-use address offer means. *See* Office Action, pages 2-3. These portions of Sawada describe the process by which a user terminal initially connects to a network using an MAC address and DHCP to obtain an IP address.

However, Sawada neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of giving a temporary-use IP address for login to the communication terminal in response to the outputting of the input packet signal to the default network by the unauthenticated signal port. Rather, Sawada discloses that after physical connection to the network, first, the user terminal sends an address request

packet. *See* Sawada, paragraph [0150]. The request is received by a LAN switch and is forwarded by the packet forwarding unit to an uplink network having an authentication server, a DHCP server, and a file server. *See* Sawada, FIG. 19, paragraphs [0144], [0155]-[0156]. In response, the router transmits an address leasing packet issued by the DHCP server to the user terminal. *See* Sawada, paragraph [0157]-[0158]. Sawada neither teaches nor suggests giving a temporary-use IP address for login to the communication terminal in response to the outputting of the input packet signal to the default network by the unauthenticated signal port, as Sawada discloses nothing about a default network. Rather, Sawada merely discloses that a DHCP server issues IP addresses in response to requests from terminals. At best, Sawada discloses a predetermined communication network having an authentication server, a DHCP server, and a file server, with no teaching or suggestion of giving a temporary-use IP address for login to the communication terminal in response to the outputting of the input packet signal to the default network by the unauthenticated signal port.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Sawada fails to disclose all the limitations in claim 1. The Monachello reference similarly fails to disclose the above-mentioned limitations of claim 1, and hence the combination of Sawada and Monachello does not render claim 1 unpatentable.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Sawada substantially discloses all the limitations of claim 1, but concedes that Sawada fails to disclose the claimed feature of

“network address bestowal means for giving to the communication terminal a network address for transferring the signal packet to a desired communication network in response to the authentication-propriety determination

means determining that the authentication has been made, and changing the correspondence between the communication terminal stored in said temporary-use IP address/communication terminal correspondence storage means to the network address from the temporary-use IP address.”

However, the Examiner asserts that Monachello allegedly cures the deficient disclosures of Sawada. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that column 4, lines 21 to 35, column 5, lines 21 to 29 and 59 to 61, and column 8, lines 6 to 15 disclose the claimed network address bestowal means. *See* Office Action, page 3. These portions of Monachello describe a method of providing multiple service providers to an individual workstation using customer premises equipment (CPE).

However, Monachello neither teaches nor suggests the limitation of “giving to the communication terminal a network address for transferring the signal packet to a desired communication network in response to the authentication propriety determination means determining that the authentication has been made.” Rather, Monachello discloses that a CPE presents a list of network service providers (NSPs) to a user. When the user has made the service selection, the CPE forces the user workstation to change its IP address from a temporary address to a global IP address. *See* Monachello, col. 4, lines 23-24, col. 5, lines 29 and 58-60. Monachello neither teaches nor suggests giving to the communication terminal a network address in response to the authentication propriety determination means determining that the authentication has been made, as Monachello discloses nothing about giving a network address in response to an authentication. Rather, Monachello discloses that network addresses are provided in response to a user’s selection of a NSP, with no teaching or suggestion of providing a network address in response to authentication.

Therefore, Monachello fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Sawada, and hence the combination of Sawada and Monachello does not render claim 1 unpatentable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 4 recites limitations similar to those discussed above, and hence the combination of Sawada and Monachello does not render claim 4 unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 11

Claims 2, 3, and 11, and 5-8 depend on claims 1 and 4, respectively, and incorporate by reference all the limitations of claims 1 and 4, and hence claims 2, 3, 5-8, and 11 should be deemed patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 4.

Claims 9 and 10

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Sawada substantially discloses all the limitations in claims 9, but concedes that Sawada fails to disclose normal IP address bestowal means for giving to the communication terminal a normal IP address in response to the authentication means determining that the communication terminal is authenticated. *See* Office Action, page 5. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that column 4, lines 21 to 35, column 5, lines 21 to 29 and 59 to 61, and column 8, lines 6 to 15 disclose the claimed normal IP address bestowal means. *See* Office Action, page 5. As discussed above, these portions of Monachello describe a method of providing multiple service providers to an individual workstation using customer premises equipment (CPE).

However, as discussed above regarding claim 1, Monachello fails to disclose “normal-IP-address bestowal means for giving to the communication terminal a normal IP address in response to the authentication means determining that the communication terminal is authenticated.” Rather, Monachello discloses that terminals obtain a global network IP address in response to a user’s NSP selection, with no teaching or suggestion of giving a normal IP address in response to authentication.

Therefore, Monachello fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Sawada, and hence the combination of Sawada and Monachello does not render claim 9 unpatentable.

Claim 10 recites a “normal-IP-address return step of, at the time that it was determined in this authentication-propriety determination step that the authentication was obtained, returning to the communication terminal a normal IP address assigned for said specific internet service provider,” which recites limitations similar to those discussed above regarding claim 9. Specifically, the claimed normal-IP-address return step requires that the normal IP address is returned at the time of authentication. However, as discussed above, Monachello merely discloses returning an IP address according to a user’s selection. Accordingly, the combination of Sawada and Monachello does not render claim 10 unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/614,800

Attorney Docket No.: Q76456

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Howard L. Bernstein/
Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 27, 2008